For the Northern District of California

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

1		
2		
3	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
4	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
5		
6		
7	ALFRED LAM, et al.,	
8	Plaintiff(s),	No. C 10-4641 PJH
9	V.	ORDER DENYING MOTION TO CONSOLIDATE
10	CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO, et al.,	TO CONSOLIDATE
11	Defendant(s).	
12	——————————————————————————————————————	_/

Before the court is plaintiffs' motion to consolidate this case with previously-filed case Alfred Lam, et al., v. City and County of San Francisco, C 08-4702, in which plaintiffs seek to add the same claims to the previously-filed case that they unsuccessfully sought to add by way of a prior motion to supplement the third amended complaint. As stated at the case management conference on September 8, 2011, the court views the attempted consolidation as a means of achieving what plaintiffs could not achieve by way of their motion to supplement. Because discovery has closed in the 2008 case and it is now ready for dispositive motions and trial and because discovery has just commenced in this case, the motion is DENIED. The October 5, 2011 date for hearing on the motion to consolidate is VACATED.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: September 9, 2011

PHYLLIS J. HAMILTON United States District Judge